1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS	
2	WESTERN DIVISION	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Docket No. 11 CR 50076
4	Plaintiff,) Rockford, Illinois) Wednesday, October 10, 2012
5	v.) 11: 12 o' clock a. m
6	ERIC INSELBERG,	
7	Defendant.	j
8		IPT OF PROCEEDINGS ORABLE P. MICHAEL MAHONEY
9	APPEARANCES:	OKADIE I. WECKEL WARDNEI
10	For the Government:	HON. GARY S. SHAPIRO
11	ror the doverment.	Acting United States Attorney (327 S. Church Street,
12		Rockford, IL 61101) by MR. MICHAEL D. LOVE
13		Assistant U.S. Attorney
14	For the Defendant:	CRITCHLEY, KINUM & VAZQUEZ, LLC (75 Livingston Avenue,
15		Roseland, NJ, 07068) by MR. EDMUND DE NOIA
16		MR. BRENDAN W CAVER
17		LAW OFFICE OF BRENDAN W CAVER, LTD. (308 W State Street,
18		Suite 97, Rockford, IL 61101)
19	Court Reporter:	Mary T. Lindbloom
20		327 S. Church Street Rockford, Illinois 61101
21		(815) 987-4486
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 (The following is from a tape-recording of proceedings:) 2 THE COURT: This is case 11 CR 50076, United States of America v. Eric Inselberg. I would request that all counsel, 3 we'll start with counsel on behalf of the United States, please 4 5 identify themselves for the court record. 6 MR. LOVE: Good morning, your Honor. Mike Love on behalf of the United States. 7 THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. 8 MR. CAVER: Good norning, your Honor. Brendan Caver on 9 10 behalf of Eric Inselberg. 11 THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. Good morning, your Honor. 12 MR. DE NOIA: **Edmund DeNoia 13** of the law firm Critchley, Kinum & Vazguez located in Roseland, 14 New Jersey, on behalf of Mr. Inselberg. 15 THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. 16 MR. DE NOIA: Good morning, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right, counsels. We had a superseding indictment come down on 9-13, 2012. I need to know where you 18 are, whether or not there was substantial additional discovery 19 20 that came with the superseding indictment. Basically give me an 21 update from the defense point of view as far as where the case 22 is at. MR. DE NOIA: Your Honor, at our last status or, 23 24 actually, at the arraignment on the superseding indictment, we 25 received additional discovery from the government.

somewhat substantial. We did review it prior to completing our motions.

I have completed the pretrial motions. They were filed on the Pacer system last night before I left to come to Illinois. I have courtesy copies of the motions with me.

Mr. Love instructed me to stop down at the Clerk's Office and file them on our way out today.

I have also turned over voluminous reciprocal discovery to Mr. Love today consisting of approximately 10,000 photographs and some additional documents to go along with that. The photographs were printed in three large binders. They're directly related to the charges against Mr. Inselberg.

The essence of the charges against Mr. Inselberg are sports memorabilia related, and a lot of the sports memorabilia has been documented in photographs turned over to Mr. Love that we believe may refute some of the allegations or the allegations against Mr. Inselberg.

THE COURT: How many motions did you file, counsel?

MR. DE NOIA: I filed a motion to dismiss based upon perjured testimony in the grand jury, a motion to dismiss based on lack of venue, a motion to transfer this case in accordance with Rule 21(b) to the District of New Jersey, a Santiago motion, and, finally, just a motion to file additional motions, if necessary.

THE COURT: Counsel, did you file the menorandum in

support of the motions along with the motions? 1 2 MR. DE NOIA: Yes, I did, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. What's the position of the 3 4 United States on all this? Your Honor, the motion presents substantial MR. LOVE: 6 issues, particularly the first one that counsel mentioned 7 regarding allegations of perjury in the investigation. Allegations such as that require us to seriously review and 8 9 consider what occurred. Additionally, the motions in and of themselves are lengthy and complex, present complex issues. 10 11 then, of course, there's the discovery that counsel mentioned. 12 I'm asking for 60 days for a response time, and I'll 13 have a motion to exclude the time period on two bases, your 14 3161(h)(1)(D) for the delay attributable to the filing 15 of a pretrial motion, but because of the prompt disposition 16 language in that subsection, also because of the allegations of 17 perjury, serious matters that those present, I'm also asking for 18 the exclusion of the time pursuant to Title 18, 3161(h)(7), in 19 that the failure to grant the continuance may result in a 20 miscarriage of justice. 21 THE COURT: All right. Let's take it one step at a 22 Does defense counsel object to the United States having 60 days to respond to all the motions? 23 24 MR. DE NOIA: No, your Honor. No objection. 25 THE COURT: All right. Then I'm going to set the

response time as far as the motions are concerned as of -- let's go with December 10, 2012.

Now, counsel, do you want to see the response before we set a reply time, or are you prepared to set a reply time at this time?

MR. DE NOIA: Your Honor, it would be our preference to see the opposition before we set the reply date. I don't know -- and to be clear, the allegations of perjury are not against the U.S. Government being complicit with any of the witnesses. It's that the actual witnesses, who happen to live in New Jersey, once they came out here perjured themselves. But once Mr. Love and the government have a chance to review it, we may have some additional matters to discuss. So, I'd rather not set a date at this point, if possible.

THE COURT: Well, what about if we came back then either like December 11th or December 12th. You'll have the response of the United States by then. We can see what's appropriate based upon the circumstances. And because of the type of notions involved and the briefing schedule the court is setting, it would be the suggestion of the court that the matter remain with the magistrate judge until such time as I get everything straightened out as to when the reply is going to be.

MR. DE NOIA: That would be fine with us, your Honor.

We actually agree with that, and Mr. Love and I spoke about that last night on the phone, as far as keeping the case with your

1 Honor. 2 THE COURT: Is either the 11th or 12th of December good 3 for both parties? 4 MR. DE NOIA: The 11th would work better, your Honor, 5 if possible. MR. LOVE: The 11th is fine with me, Judge. 7 THE COURT: All right. I'll bring the case back then **12-11**, **2012**. I'll bring it back at 11:00 o'clock in the morning 8 for a status, as far as matters are concerned. 9 10 Now, what's the position of the defendant going to be 11 in regard to the motion I'm going to get in regard to exclusion 12 under the Speedy Trial Act? 13 MR. DE NOIA: No objection, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Counsel, why don't you go ahead 15 and make the notion then. Your Honor, pursuant to Title 18, United 16 MR. LOVE: 17 States Code, Section 3161 subsections (h)(1)(D) and (h)(7), the United States moves to exclude the time period from today 18 19 through and including December 10th for the reason that the 20 delay is attributable to the pretrial motion and also for the 21 reason that the failure to grant the continuation of proceedings 22 would result in a miscarriage of justice. 23 THE COURT: Counsel, have you had the opportunity to 24 discuss the motion with your client, and does he have any 25 objection to the motion?

MR. DE NOIA: Your Honor, we've discussed the issue at length, and he has no objection.

THE COURT: All right. Here's what I'm going to do.

I'm going to grant the motion of the United States. I'm going to exclude the period of time from today's date, October 10th, 2012, through December 10th, 2012, and I'm going to do it for two reasons. One, a substantial number of motions are under advisement and that the matter has to be briefed, including a reply brief, in order for the district court to have the opportunity to review the motion.

But also because the period of time of 60 days to respond to the motion is unusually long, the court is going to take that into consideration and also do the balancing required under 18 U.S.C. 3161(h)(7) in where I balance the interest of the general public and the defendant to a speedy trial versus whether or not there is a potentiality here for a miscarriage of justice, and balancing those issues, I find that this additional time in order for the United States to respond to and investigate the allegations which are contained in the motion outweigh the interest that the defendant and the general public have to a speedy trial. Therefore, under the ends of justice provision, I'm also going to exclude that same period of time and, as I said, bring everybody back on the 12-11 date at 11:00 o'clock. We'll see where we're at at that point in time.

Anything I didn't cover on behalf of the defendant?

1	MR. DE NOIA: No, your Honor.	
2	THE COURT: Anything on behalf of the United States?	
3	MR. LOVE: No, your Honor. Thank you.	
4	THE COURT: Have a great day, counsels, would you,	
5	please?	
6	MR. DE NOIA: Thank you, your Honor.	
7	(Which were all the proceedings had in the above-entitled	
8	cause on the day and date aforesaid.)	
9	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from	
10	the tape-recording of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.	
11		
12		
13	Mary T. Lindbloom Official Court Reporter	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		